

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 RODNEY JEROME WOMACK,) No. C 08-3594 MMC (PR)
11 Petitioner,)
12 v.)
13 J. WALKER, Warden,)
14 Respondent.)

)

16 On July 28, 2008, petitioner, a California prisoner proceeding pro se, filed the above-
17 titled petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Petitioner has paid
18 the filing fee.

BACKGROUND

20 In 2005, in the Superior Court of Contra Costa County (“Superior Court”), petitioner
21 was found guilty of second degree robbery. He was sentenced to a term of thirty-five years
22 to life in state prison. The California Court of Appeal affirmed the conviction, and the
23 California Supreme Court denied review. Thereafter, petitioner sought state habeas corpus
24 relief in the Superior Court, the California Court of Appeal, and the California Supreme
25 Court. All of the state habeas petitions were denied.

DISCUSSION

27 || A. Standard of Review

28 This Court may entertain a petition for a writ of habeas corpus "in behalf of a person

1 in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court only on the ground that he is in custody
2 in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States.” 28 U.S.C. § 2254(a);
3 Rose v. Hedges, 423 U.S. 19, 21 (1975). A district court shall “award the writ or issue an
4 order directing the respondent to show cause why the writ should not be granted, unless it
5 appears from the application that the applicant or person detained is not entitled thereto.”
6 28 U.S.C. § 2243. Summary dismissal is appropriate only where the allegations in the
7 petition are vague or conclusory, palpably incredible, or patently frivolous or false. See
8 Hendricks v. Vasquez, 908 F.2d 490, 491 (9th Cir. 1990) (quoting Blackledge v. Allison,
9 431 U.S. 63, 75-76 (1977)).

10 B. Petitioner’s Claims

11 Petitioner asserts he is entitled to relief on six separate grounds of ineffective
12 assistance of appellate counsel. Liberally construed, petitioner’s claims are cognizable. See
13 Evitts v. Lucey, 469 U.S. 387, 391-405 (1985) (holding Due Process Clause of Fourteenth
14 Amendment guarantees criminal defendant effective assistance of counsel on first appeal as
15 of right).

16 **CONCLUSION**

17 For the reasons stated above, the Court orders as follows:

18 1. The Clerk of the Court shall serve by certified mail a copy of this order and the
19 petition (Docket No. 1) on respondent and respondent’s counsel, the Attorney General for the
20 State of California. The Clerk shall also serve a copy of this order on petitioner.

21 2. Respondent shall file with the Court and serve on petitioner, within **ninety (90)**
22 days of the date this order is filed, an answer conforming in all respects to Rule 5 of the
23 Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, showing cause why a writ of habeas corpus should not
24 be granted based on petitioner’s cognizable claims. Respondent shall file with the answer
25 and serve on petitioner a copy of all portions of the state trial record that have been
26 transcribed previously and that are relevant to a determination of the issues presented by the
27 petition.

28 If petitioner wishes to respond to the answer, he shall do so by filing a traverse with

United States District Court

For the Northern District of California

1 the Court and serving it on respondent's counsel within **thirty (30)** days of the date the
2 answer is filed.

3 3. In lieu of an answer, respondent may file, within **ninety (90)** days of the date this
4 order is filed, a motion to dismiss on procedural grounds, as set forth in the Advisory
5 Committee Notes to Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. If respondent files
6 such a motion, petitioner shall file with the Court and serve on respondent an opposition or
7 statement of non-opposition within **thirty (30)** days of the date the motion is filed, and
8 respondent shall file with the Court and serve on petitioner a reply within **fifteen (15)** days of
9 the date any opposition is filed.

10 4. Petitioner is reminded that all communications with the Court must be served on
11 respondent by mailing a true copy of the document to respondent's counsel.

12 5. It is petitioner's responsibility to prosecute this case. Petitioner must keep the
13 Court and respondent informed of any change of address and must comply with the Court's
14 orders in a timely fashion. Failure to do so may result in the dismissal of this action for
15 failure to prosecute pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).

16 6. Upon a showing of good cause, requests for a reasonable extension of time will be
17 granted provided they are filed on or before the deadline they seek to extend.

18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 DATED: January 29, 2009

Maxine M. Chesney
MAXINE M. CHESNEY
United States District Judge

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28